

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 28 and 36 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-12, 15-19 and 21-37 are now pending in this application.

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by the Examiner during a telephonic interview conducted on May 13, 2004. A Statement of the Substance of the Interview is submitted herewith.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter made in the Office Action with respect to claims 15-19, 21-25 and 37.

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 and 26-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,672,432 to Sakurada et al. (hereinafter "Sakurada") in view of U.S. Patent 6,273,550 to Brown (hereinafter "Brown").

As suggested by the Examiner in the interview of May 13, 2004, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 36 to more clearly recite the invention as being applicable to color printing. Accordingly, amended claims 1 and 36 recite "at least one of said dark dye nozzles is adapted for color printing." Thus, claims 1 and 36 are now in allowable form. Claims 2-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Independent claims 26 and 27 each recite a printing system "wherein the ink used during high-speed printing is stored in the supplies coupled to the dark dye nozzles." As

acknowledged in a previous Office Action dated August 1, 2003, the prior art did not cite this feature. Accordingly, as agreed to by the Examiner in the interview of May 13, 2004, independent claims 26 and 27 are patentable.

Claim 28 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Claims 28-33 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 27, and claims 34 and 35 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 26. Therefore, claims 28-35 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

5/17/04

By

Sanjeev K. Dhand

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Sanjeev K. Dhand
Registration No. 51,182
For
William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874